

Re



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,257	07/31/2001	Richard J. Redpath	RSW920010136US1	2814

7590 12/15/2004

A. Bruce Clay
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,257

Applicant(s)

REDPATH, RICHARD J.

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/31/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.
2. The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e. updated the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 1, line 8. The entire specification should be so revised).

Drawings

3. The drawings were received on 8/27/01. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai et al (6,108,714) in view of Holland (6,243,860).

6. As per claim 1, Kumagai teaches the invention as claimed including a method for chaining applications, comprising:
receiving a request for a service associated with a chaining module(col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 5, lines 47-51);
receiving a series of applications from an option corresponding to the chaining module(col. 2 lines 44-5; Fig. 15, s32, s35; col. 5, lines 47-51; col. 7, lines 31-35).

Kumagai does not specifically teach the use of passing the output of one application to the other.

Holland teaches executing the series of applications in order and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Holland and Kumagi because Holland's use of and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application would improve Kumagis system by reducing the resources needed to translate different languages.

7. As per claim 2, Kumagai teaches a method the service is registered in a properties file as a name associated with the chaining module (col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).
8. As per claim 3, Kumagai teaches a method wherein the option is specified in the properties file (col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).

9. As per claim 4, Kumagai teaches a method wherein the series of applications comprises a first application and a second application and the step of executing the series of applications comprises:

executing the first application (fig 15, s32; col. 1, lines 37-50); and

executing the second application (fig 15, s35; col. 1, lines 37-50).

Holland teaches executing the series of applications in order and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

10. As per claim 5, Holland teaches a method wherein the step of executing the series of applications further comprises, returning the output of the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

11. As per claims 6, Holland teaches a method wherein the first application is a customer verification application (col. 20 lines 10-12).

12. As per claims 7, Holland teaches a method wherein second application is a language translation engine (col. 1 lines 14-20; col. 19 lines 25-32).

13. As per claims 8, Holland teaches a method wherein the first application and the second application are language translation engines (col. 1 lines 14-20; col. 19 lines 25-32).

14. As per claim 9, Kumagai teaches an apparatus for chaining applications, comprising:

first receipt means for receiving a request for a service associated with a chaining

module(col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 5, lines 47-51); and

second receipt means for receiving a series of applications from an option corresponding to the chaining module(col. 2 lines 44-51).

Holland teaches a method wherein the step of executing the series of applications further comprises, returning the output of the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

15. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected based on the same rejections as claims 2 and 3 above.

16. As per claim 12, Kumagai teaches an apparatus for chaining applications, comprising:

a first application (fig 15, s32; col. 1, lines 37-50) and

a second application (fig 15, s35; col. 1, lines 37-50).

Holland teaches a chaining module, wherein the chaining module receives an option that identifies a series of applications comprising the first application and the second application, executes the first application, passes the output of the first application to the input of the second application, and executes the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

17. As per claim 13, Kumagai teaches an apparatus wherein the option is specified in a properties file(col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).

18. As per claim 14, Holland teaches an apparatus wherein the chaining module returns the output of the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).
19. Claims 15-17 are rejected based on the same rejection as claims 6-8 above.
20. As per claim 18, Kumagai teaches an apparatus wherein the first application and the second application implement an interface (col. 1 line 16-21; col.1 lines 52-56).
21. As per claim 19, Kumagai teaches an apparatus module implements the interface, wherein the chaining (col. 1 line 16-21; col.1 lines 52-56).
22. Claim 20 is rejected based on the same rejection as claim 1 above.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yang et al (5,493,525) teaches the use of a complier that is based on carry chain structures. Christensen et al (5,333,304) teaches the use of an application complier based on prelude routines.
24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

Art Unit: 2127

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

NS
November 23, 2003


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY/PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100